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#### Abstract

This paper explores the textual metafunctional patterns in two fictional versions of a Biblical Parable in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's novel Devil on the Cross (1982) in order to find the similarities and differences between their compositional features. It critically draws on the theory of systemic functional linguistics expounded by specialists like Halliday (1994), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and Eggins (2004) to overview the theoretical background to the study, with focus on the grammar of textual meaning, proposes a new Theme classification and uses it to analyze the Thematic structure and taxis system of the two extracts. The researcher has come to the conclusion that, though they are initially spoken, these texts show such interesting textual-meaning properties as the density of ellipsis, of circumstantial and interpersonal thematization, of taxis and rank shift that they should be qualified to belong to both spoken and written mode of discourse.


Keywords: textual metafunction, Theme, ellipsis, foregrounding, parataxis, hypotaxis

## 1. Introduction

It is well-known that the Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o heavily draws on the Bible for his literary composition, namely in terms of characterization by description and speech (Ngara, 1985; Amoussou, 2011, 2015). Indeed, in most of his novels, the writer enrolls his characters after figures from the Bible and Kenyan politics by making them talk or think the Bible without any forewarning to the readers. This is exactly what happens in his fifth novel Devil on the Cross (1982) when two fictional characters, a socialist-inclined one ( text $_{1}$ ) and a capitalist-inclined one ( $\mathrm{text}_{2}$ ), draw on Matthew 25: 14-46 to speak, first to a group taxi-boarders and then to an assembly of 'robbers' or 'capitalists'. While text ${ }_{1}$ is a near word-for-word reproduction of the source text, text $_{2}$ is a fictional adaptation of it.
This article analyses the Theme patterns and logical relations in the two texts in order to reveal their major characteristics. Such an endeavor falls within the realm of the grammar of textual meaning/THEME. Following the tradition of the Prague School linguists, the word 'Theme/Thematic' is written with a capital initial as a label for 'the textual functional constituent' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 64) but it is fully capitalized when it refers to the whole grammar or when used to display the 'Thematic structure' of clauses (Eggins, 1994).

## 2. Theoretical Framework: Textual Metafunction, Thematic Structure and Taxis

Of the three language functions -the experiential, the interpersonal, and the textual- advocated in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)- the last one plays a vital part in the expression of the first two. Matthiessen (1995) alludes to this hinge role of the textual metafunction in writing:

The textual metafunction allows the ideational and interpersonal features of a text to be understood by the speaker/writer and listener/reader: It has a distinctive part to play in the overall creation of meaning -one that is oriented specifically towards the creation of meaning in the realm of semiotics (p.20).

In fact, the textual meaning refers to the one that comes from the way a piece of writing or speech is organized or structured; it is the meaning about how what is being said hangs together and relates to what has been said before and the context around the interactants. In short, it basically has to do with Thematic structure, cohesion and coherence, as opined by Wang (2010: 256):

The textual function refers to the fact that language has mechanisms to make any stretch of spoken or written discourse into a coherent and unified text and make a living passage different from a random list of sentences. Although two sentences may have exactly the same ideational and interpersonal functions, they may be different in terms of textual coherence" (my emphasis).

This function relates to the register variable of 'mode/mode of discourse', a term used to designate the role language plays in an interaction and the amount of feedback: whether it is spoken or written; if it is spoken, it is either formal or casual conversation, and if written, it either every day or technical language. This influences language use as it is not used in the same way to speak as to write. The grammar of textual meaning or THEME (Eggins, 2004: 296) or 'the grammar of the clause as a message' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 64) has thus to do with the structuring of the message in terms of what is its departure point - the Theme, and what is being said/done about that departure point-the Rheme. Eggins (2004: 298) argues that this function is expressed through two key systems: 'Thematic Structure and Information Structure', the former having to do with the organization/division of the clause into its Theme-Rheme constituents and the latter with its organization into its Given-New ones drawing on intonation choices (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 87-92).
The 'Theme-Rheme' distinction is often blurred for its relation to the traditional grammarians' division of the sentence into 'subject + predicate' on the one hand (Walsh \& Walsh, 1966; Quirk, et al., 1972) and the functional structuralists' practice of breaking information structure into 'Given-New' on the other (Brown \& Yule, 1988; Martin, 1992; Matthiessen, 1995; Eggins, 2004; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004). While the existence of three different types of subjects (grammatical, logical and psychological) can lead to the 'Subject-Theme' confusion (Hasan \& Fries, 1995; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 53-62; Eggins, 2004: 136), the habitual occurrence of both the 'Theme' and the 'Given' in the initial position makes the 'Theme-Given' distinction much fuzzier (Brown and Yule, 1988; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004). Brown and Yule (1988: 154) simply argue that 'Given' refers to what is already known or predictable by the reader/listener while 'New' refers to what is not". Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) offer a definition that can help to distinguish between the information structure, i.e., 'Given+ New', and Thematic structure, i.e., 'Theme +Rheme':

Though they are related, 'Given + New' and 'Theme + Rheme' are not the same thing. The Theme is what I, the speaker, choose to take as my point of departure. The Given is what you, the listener, already know or have accessible to you. 'Theme + Rheme' is speaker-oriented, whereas 'Given + New' is listener-oriented (p. 93, my emphasis).

Even then, both the 'Given' and the 'Theme' largely depend on the writer's/speaker's assumption as to what reader/listener already knows or can easily recuperate from the context. Indeed, both are selected by the speaker/writer depending on his/her particular psychological concern or angle of vision (Brown \&Yule, 1988). That is certainly why Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 55) see the Theme in terms of 'psychological subject'.
In addition, there is some confusion from one scholar to another regarding the 'Theme-Given' hierarchy and the 'Rheme-New' one. For instance, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 93) argue that 'the Theme falls within the Given and the New within the Rheme" while Eggins (2004: 229,300) contends that 'the Theme typically contains familiar, or 'given' information and that "the Rheme typically contains unfamiliar, or 'new', information" (my emphasis). Even the conceptual definitions cannot at times help to clear the fog. Such definitions of 'the Theme' as 'the point of departure of the sentence', 'the left-most constituent of the clause or sentence', 'the starting point of the utterance' and 'the constituent which is 'the concern of the message'(Halliday, 1967: 212; Brown \& Yule, 1988: 126, 135;Halliday \& Matthiessen 2004: 55; Eggins, 2004: 136 ) fail to define the boundary of the Theme, especially when the concept of 'left-most constituent' becomes difficult to apply to such functional morphemes as conjunctions which often occur in initial positions to play a more cohesive/non-structural function between clauses than a structural/grammatical one within a single clause (Eggins, 2004: 47-51; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 538-59). There also is no way to clearly cut the Theme from the Rheme in this definition by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 64): "the Theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the message within its context....The Rheme is the remainder of the message, the part in which the Theme is developed".
It thus emerges that determining what stands for the 'Theme' is not an easy task. Fortunately, Halliday (1994: 53) offers a definition that can serve as the linchpin for Theme analysis: "the Theme extends from the beginning of the clause up to (and including) the first element that has a function in transitivity". In other words, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 79) specify that: "the Theme of a clause ends with the first constituent that is participant, circumstance or process. We refer to this constituent in the textual function as topical theme". This means that a transitivity-labeled item is the obligatory constituent in the structure/composition of Theme: "every clause must contain one and only one topical Theme" (Eggins, 1994:277; 2004: 302).
Part of the confusion is due to the fact that constituents with different lexico-grammatical labels (experiential, interpersonal, and textual) can function as Theme, giving rise to three major types of Theme: topical, interpersonal and textual Theme. The topical Theme is the constituent which serves as the departure point and to which a transitivity label (participant, process, or circumstance) can be assigned (Halliday, 1994; Eggins, 1994/2004). The interpersonal theme is the one to which a mood label (subject, finite, vocative...etc) can be assigned while the textual theme is the one bearing neither transitivity nor mood label, but which does a rather cohesive work by relating a whole clause to its context.
It must also be pointed out that, in addition to these three general categories of 'Theme', other specific types can be distinguished. For example, a topical Theme can be 'unmarked' or 'marked'. A topical Theme is said to be 'unmarked' when it is used in its normal or expected subject position. However, when such an item occurs in a position that is not normally its, then it becomes used as 'a marked topical theme'. Even the other two types of Theme (interpersonal and
textual) can be marked. In (1b), (2b)and (3b) in Table ${ }_{1}$ below, the item 'in this country' is a circumstantial adjunct used as a 'marked topical Theme', 'never again shall..' are modal locutions used as 'marked interpersonal Themes' and 'thus' is a conjunction used as a 'marked textual Theme'.

Table 1. Unmarked vs. Marked Themes: inspired from Eggins (2004: 301-308)

| $\mathbf{n}^{\circ}$ | unmarked Theme | marked Theme |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (5) | (a) Most people eat rice in this country. | (b) In this country, most people eat rice. |
| (6) | (a) I shall never bow down to the lifeless god of <br> money again. | (b) Never again shall I bow down to the lifeless |
| god of money. |  |  |, | (7) | (a) I was thus left the only child of my mother. | (b) Thus was I left the only child of my mother. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

There also is what is known as a 'multiple Theme'. Indeed, Eggins (2004: 307) argues that when several textual Themes or/ and interpersonal Themes occur before the obligatory topical Theme, the combination is known as a 'multiple Theme'. Distinction should also be made between 'a textual Theme' and 'a structural one'. While the former is generally a coordinating conjunction (and, then, but, yet, however, etc.), a subordinating conjunction (when, before, after, how, etc) or a continuity adjunct (oh, yes/yea, no, well, etc.), the latter has to do with the use of relative pronouns such as 'who, which, that, etc.' to introduce embedded clauses.
The foregoing entails that exploring the textual metafunction should involve, in addition to the analysis of Thematic and Information Structures, that of taxis and rankshift, as Matthiessen, Teruya \& Lam (2015: 221) argue that the textual metafunction includes such systems as "THEME, INFORMATION, CONJUNCTION, SUBSTITUTION-ELLIPSIS, REFERENCE and LEXICAL COHESION" (authors' capitals). In fact, the tactic system describes the kind of interdependency relationship between clauses linked together into complexes. This involves parataxis/coordination, when clauses are related as equal, independent entities, and hypotaxis/subordination, when clauses relate to a main clause through a dependency relationship (Eggins, 2004: 258). Interestingly, Halliday (1994: 224) describes parataxis and hypotaxis as "the two basic forms taken by logical relations in natural language". The tactic system is somehow opposed to rankshift/embedding. While taxis, through coordination and subordination (addition, contrast, variation, temporality, causality, etc.), involves expansion, rankshift implies compression, packing more meanings into units by bundling a whole clause into a unit of a lower rank (Eggins, 2004: 269).
Finally, it is worth noting that Thematic Structure analysis is particularly interested in such deviations from the normal patterning that convey particular messages. A key step in the exploration of the textual metafunction is thus to observe such deviations in theme-patterns as the inversion of word-order, logical connectors and the construction involved in the hierarchies of clauses, all of which must serve some aesthetic function such as emphasis or explicitness, or their opposites - the aesthetically justified blurring of distinctions or obscurity. As Martin (1992: 12) puts it, "the different patterns and meanings made by the choice of Theme can be manipulated and exploited, consciously or subconsciously, by the writer in order to convey their 'angle' or viewpoint'".

## 3. Methodological Perspective

For the purpose of this analysis, each of the two texts is divided in its constituent clauses. Each clause is numbered and each Theme-type is underlined, labeled and quantified (see the appendix). Plain numbers -i.e. (1) (2)- show ranking clauses while these numbers followed by a dot and other numbers -i.e. (1.1) (2.1.2)- indicate rankshifted clauses, a rankshifted clause being a complete clause carrying out the function of a noun phrase or of just a word acting either as complementiser or modifier within the noun phrase. In addition, as different lexico-grammatical labels (experiential, interpersonal, and textual) can coexist within the Theme, I propose the structure-oriented classification summed up in table 2:

Table 2. The researcher's proposed Theme classification

| Theme <br> classes | structure/composition of the Theme |
| :--- | :--- |
| (a) | 'only a transitivity-label item or topical Theme' |
| (b) | 'textual element+ topical theme' |
| (c) | 'Interpersonal element+ topical theme' |
| (d) | 'textual element +Interpersonal element+ topical Theme'/ |
|  | 'Interpersonal element+ Textual element + topical theme' |
| (e) | 'structural element' |
| (f) | 'textual element+ structural element/'structural element+ Topical theme' |

This classification offers a big advantage: it makes Theme-identification within the clause less cumbersome, as it helps to avoid using many theme-labels in the same clause. In addition, it helps to clearly show the hierarchy between the
clauses: classes (b) (c), and (d) reveal clause coordination and subordination while classes (e), and (f)) shed light on rankshift in terms of complementization and relative definition. It must be noted that some letters are followed by ( + ); this signals markedness. In addition, while Eggins (2004: 311) considers the particle 'let's/let us' as 'a topical Theme', it is taken as 'an interpersonal One' in this research not only because the real 'verb/process' is the base-verb after the particle, but also, especially as it is used as a synonym for 'shall we....?' Indeed, the combination 'let/may +topical theme/subject +base verb' is used to express theoretical assumptions in mathematics or hope/wish in Biblical invocations (Genesis $1: 3,6,9,14,20,24,26$, etc.; Psalms 25: 21; 31: 17, 18, 21; 32: 8; 33: 22; 34: 3; 35: 4, 5, 8, 25, 26, 27, etc.). Moreover, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 513) consider the use of 'let' in such a causative-like structure as a form of verbal modulation. The same applies for such praise-laden phrases like 'long live' (i.e. may...live long) in text $_{2}$, which are thus treated as class (c) Theme: 'interpersonal +topical items'.
The first section of the analysis looks into the Thematic structure in terms of Theme classes and structures while the second deals with Taxis and Rankshift.

## 4. Analysis of Theme Types and Thematic Structure in the texts.

As the parenthetical sequences provided by the analyst in the appendix show, both texts exhibit a significant number of elliptical items, which has made Theme identification a real challenge, as the omitted strings sometimes include the obligatory component of Theme, the experiential Theme. While text contains 40 elliptical clauses ( $\mathbf{2 8 . 5 7 \%} \mathbf{)}$ - $3,4,5,6$, $8,9,12,13,17,26,33,34.2,34.3,36,37,40,41.2,52,58,70,76,78,79,80,81,82,84,85,87,97,99,101,102,106$, $107,108,109,110,111,117-$ text $_{2}$ has $43(15.47 \%)-(2.1,9,20,23.1,24,29,31,33,40.1,53,68,71,72,73,75,76$, $79,80,81,84,86.2,91,96,97,98,100.1,102.1,104,120,138,143,148,151,153,165.1,169,176,184,203,213$, $218,219,220$. In particular, the absence of the 'vocative +topical Theme' 'Lord, when'(83) from clauses ' $85,87,89$, 91 , and $92^{\prime}\left(\right.$ text $\left._{1}\right)$ is due to the use of this combination as a common factor for them, which is why they are taken to belong to the same class (c), despite the conjunction 'or'. The same combination is used in (112) to cover clauses '113, $114,115,116$ and $117^{\prime}$, which are thus categorized accordingly. It must be pointed out that ellipsis is an indication of 'given-ness'; i.e., the elided item has always appeared earlier in the text and is being zero-reiterated or is presented as such based on the writer's presupposition about the reader's/listener ability to recuperate it. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 535) put it this way: "Ellipsis makes it possible to leave out parts of a structure when they can be presumed from what has gone before. Ellipsis indicates continuity, allowing speaker and addressee to focus on what is contrastive".
While this significant occurrence of elliptical topical and interpersonal Themes can well give the impression of a carefully written mode, the rate gap between the two texts in the density of these also implies that text ${ }_{1}$ is in a more carefully written more than text $t_{2}$. This means that even though the writer draws on Bible discourse, he somehow adjusts the mode character-wise or register-wise to reflect linguistic differences. Indeed, both the imaginary and real speaker/Lord in text ${ }_{1}$ is Christ while real speaker in text ${ }_{2}$ is a robber, speaking from the point of view of an imaginary Lord, a colonial capitalist, a master robber.
A look at the Theme-identification process (appendix) shows that text contains 140 clauses and thus 140 Themes, while text 2 has 277. Table $_{3}$ below gives a statistical account of the identified Themes on the basis of the classification proposed in table 3.
Table 3. Numerical and statistical distribution of Themes in the texts

| Theme classes | Texts | Clauses of occurrence | Quantity\& rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (a) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{(+)}, 5^{(+)}, 10,14^{(+)}, 20,22,23,24,25,28,30,31,39,42,44^{(+)}, 50,60,61 ; 64, \\ & 66,68,70,72,90,92,115 . \end{aligned}$ | 26(18.57\%) |
|  | Text ${ }_{2}$ | $2,3,4,5,6,10,15,16^{(+)}, 19,22,23,26,28,32,36,42,44,54,57,59,65,70^{(+)}, 71^{(+)}$, $73^{(+)}, 74^{(+)}, 83,89,90^{(+)}, 101,102,106,109,110,111,112,113^{(+)}, 116,117$, $118,126,127,129,130,131,132^{(+)}, 133,134,140,143,145,146,148,155$, $156,158,159,161,162,164,165,172,175,177,178,181^{(+)}, 183,186,190$, $191^{(+)}, 192,194,199,200^{(+)}, 201,203,214,215,217$. | 78(28.16\%) |
| (b) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,2,4^{(+)}, 6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,17,32,33,35,36,37,40,43,45 \text {, } \\ & 46^{(+)}, 47,48^{(+)}, 49,51,52,54,55,56,57,58,62,63,65,67,69,71,73,76,78 \text {, } \\ & 80,82,85,86,87,89,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,111,114 \text {, } \\ & 116,117 . \end{aligned}$ | 63(45\%) |
|  | Text ${ }_{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,7,9,11,12,13,14,17,20,21,25,27,29,30,31,33,34,37,40,41,43,45 \text {, } \\ & 46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,55,56,58,60,61,62,66,69,72^{(+)}, 75^{(+)}, 76^{(+)} \text {, } \\ & 77,78,79,80,81,82,84,85,86,87,88,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99 \text {; } \\ & 100,103,104,107,108,113,115,119,120,123,124,128,134,135,137 \text {, } \\ & 138,142,144,149,150,151,152,154,157,163,166,169,171,174,184 \text {, } \\ & 185,187^{(+)}, 188^{(+)}, 189^{(+)}, 193,195,198,202,204+, 205,206,207,208,209 \text {, } \\ & 210,211 . \end{aligned}$ | 107(38.63\%) |
| (c) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,19,21,26,27,29,34,38,41,75,77,79,81,83,84,88,105,106,107 \text {, } \\ & 108,109,110,113 . \end{aligned}$ | 23 (16.43\%) |

Text ${ }_{2} 24,35,38,39,63,64,67,68,105,121,122,125,139,141,153,160,167,168$, $170,176,179,180,196,213^{(+)}, 218^{(+)}, 219^{(+)}, 220^{(+)}$.

27(09.75\%)

| (d) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | 53,59, 74, 91, 104, 112. | 06(04.29\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Text ${ }_{2}$ | 18, 148,173, 182, 212. | 05(01.80\%) |
| (e) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | 1.1, 1.2, 7.1, 10.1, 11.1, 16.1, 24.1, 32.1, 38.1, 41.1.1., 41.2.1; 46.1, 46.1, 58.1. | 14(10\%) |
|  | Text ${ }_{2}$ | ```1.1, 1.1.1.1, 2.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.1.1, 17.1, 21.1, 23.1, 40.1, 47.1, 47.2, 78.1, 82.1, 86.1, 87.1, 94.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 119.1, 130.1, 135.1, 137.1, 144.1, 145.1, 146.1, 163.1, 164.1, 167.1, 173.1, 174.1, 176.1, 180.1, 186.1, 189.1, 193.1, 211.1, 212.1.``` | 38 (13.71\%) |
| (f) | Text ${ }_{1}$ | 34.1, 34.2, 34.2.1, 34.3, 34.3.1, 41.1, 41.2, 48.2 | 08(05.71\%) |
|  | Text ${ }_{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 .1,4.1,12.1,21.2,26.1,27.1,34.1,34.2,35.1,56.1,86.2,89.1,90.1 \text {, } \\ & 100.1,110.1,127.1,157.1,170.1,170.1 .1,175.1,185.1,185.2 . \end{aligned}$ | 22(07.94\%) |

It must be noticed that the dominant topical-Theme function is played by participants in both texts. In text ${ }_{1}$, they play this function in 100 of the 118 ranking clauses, i.e., $\mathbf{8 4 . 4 7 \%}$ of the total transitivity function in the Thematic structure. The same applies for text $_{2}$ in which the dominant experiential Theme function in the Theme structure is played by participants in 187 of the 218 ranking clauses, i.e., $\mathbf{8 5 . 7 8 \%}$. These high rates of participants in the Thematic structure can be accounted for by the fact that most sentence forms (affirmative, negative, interrogative, interro-negative, etc.) normally require a participant. However, the use of 'wh-words' as topical themes signal the demand/search for the identity of some element in the content or for relatively long missing pieces of information from an addressee (Halliday \& Matthiessen 2004: 75) as in clauses‘ $75,77,79,81,83,84,105,106,107,108,109,110$ ' (text ${ }_{1}$ ) and in ' $32,36,142$, $147,171,172,176,192,215$ ' ( text $_{2}$ ), which signals a spoken face-to-face mode.
All the processes used as topical Themes, be they of class (a) or (b), are imperatives -' $23,31,44,45,49,60,61,92$ ' in text ${ }_{1}$, and ' $112,113,129,156,157,183,186,187,192,193,194,197$ ' in text ${ }_{2}$. Though this front position reflects the normal structure of the imperative, the occurrence of this mood reinforces that of 'wh-questions' in signaling demand of action from a present addressee. Similarly, almost all circumstances used as topical Themes are marked/foregrounded: ${ }^{\prime} 2,3,4,5,14,46,48,54$ ' (text ${ }_{1}$ ) and ' $7,17,49,71,72,73,74,75,76,81,90,117,128,132,163,169,181,188,189$, 199, 200, 214 ( $\operatorname{text}_{2}$ ). It must be noted that the terms 'foregrounding', 'marked-ness', 'thematization' and 'topicalization' are used as near synonyms (Brown \& Yule, 1988; Eggins, 2004) to refer to "the movement of an element to the beginning of a clause/sentence so that it can act as its Theme" (Crystal, 1995: 459).
The foregrounding of circumstantial elements in the texts has three possible interpretations among others. First, it stresses not only the importance of the situational context in the description of participants and processes but also the speaker's or writer's psychological priority to this (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 55; Eggins, 2004: 136). This thematization of circumstances is perhaps the best illustration of the view of the Theme as 'the psychological subject' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004: 55; Eggins, 2004: 136). Secondly, this circumstantial markedness appears as a realization of a carefully-written mode as the writer must have planned the rhetorical development of the text to achieve this level of foregrounding (Eggins, 1994: 319). Finally, Eggins (2004: 339) argues that significant thematization of circumstantial adjuncts shows that the information expressed in both texts is presented as non-arguable, a strategy to express the speaker's authority on the addressee.
Eggins (2004: 315) suggests two levels of analysis for subordinate clauses in frontal position: first a clause-by-clause analysis in which each is taken to have its own Thematic structure; then a second level of analysis in which the firstplaced dependent clause serves as the Theme for the whole complex, the main clause serving as the Rheme. The first level of analysis is thus already carried out in treating such foregrounded subordinate clauses as '51, 89, 114' (text ${ }^{\prime}$ ) and ' $7,13 / 14,25,27,43,93$, and 164 ' ( text $_{2}$ ) as any other clause in terms of their Thematic structure. At the second level, clause ' 51 ' serves as 'the Theme' for ' 52 ' which is 'the Rheme', just as ' 89 ' does for ' 90 ' and ' 114 ' for ' 115 ' (text $)_{1}$. In text ${ }_{2}$, the same applies for ' $7-8$ ', '13/14-15', '25-26', '27-28', '43-44', '93-94', '164-165' and '202-203'. These clauses must thus be seen to play the same function as marked circumstantial elements in simple clauses (Eggins, 2004: 315). Table ${ }_{4.1}$ shows the two levels of analysis for ' $89-90^{\prime}$ ' text $_{1}$ ) and table ${ }_{4.2}$ does for same for '43-44' (text 2 ), the same thing being applicable for any of the pairs listed above.

Table 4.1 two-level Thematic structure analysis of clauses '89-90'

| (89) |  |  | (90) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In as much as | Ye | have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren | Ye | have done it unto me. |
| textual | Topical |  | topical |  |
| THEME |  | RHEME | THEME | RHEME |
| THEME |  |  | RHEME |  |


| ${ }^{(42)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| If | That | were not so |  |  |  |
| textual | Topical |  |  |  |  |
| THEME |  | RHEME |  |  | would have told you. |
| THEME |  |  |  |  |  |

Themes of classes(c) and (d) prove to be very revealing as to tenor in both texts, namely in text ${ }_{1}$. Indeed, most Themes of class (c) have a vocative adjunct, i.e., the item 'Lord' as the interpersonal Theme (19, 27, 35, 42, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, $85,106,107,108,109,110$, and 111). Here, it is useful to point out the combination 'vocative +topical theme' 'Lord, when' used in (76) and (106) covers respectively ' $78,80,82,84,85$ ' and ' $107,108,109,110,111$ ', which is why they are taken as belonging to the same class, despite the initial conjunction 'or' in the last five cases. The other Themes of this class have a mood adjunct as the interpersonal part of the Theme: $20,22,28,30,39,89$, and 114 , even though there is a combination of a mood adjunct and a vocative in (30). All class (d) Themes are in the form of 'then+ shall...' (54, $60,75,105,113$, and 114). The foregrounding of this strong modulator not only reinforces the third interpretation earlier provided for circumstantial markedness, but also the master-servant relationship between the speaker and his listeners, on the one hand, and the imperativeness of the judgment given to both the lawful and unlawful servants, on the other.
Text ${ }_{2}$ contains about 27 thematically-positioned interpersonal elements, with 06 starting with 'a Finite verbal operator' ( $35,38,171,178,168$, and 169 ), especially the strong-tenored 'did you not....?' (35) and the combination of a loaded vocative and a strong-tenored modulator 'could you not' $(168,169)$. The occurrence of this modulator in loadedvocative interrogatives reinforces the hostile tenor of the imperialist lord to the rebellious-minded servant. The contribution of 'wh-interrogatives' ( $32,33,36,65,143,171,175,181,201$, and 214), especially the high-tenored ones with 'how can you...?' $(32,33,36)$ and elliptical ones ' $143,147,201$ ', cannot be overlooked as they express the reciprocal hostile tenor between socialist-minded servant and the master. Some of the remaining interpersonal Themes are introduced by vocatives ( $105,121,138,141,180$ ), others by mood adjuncts such as 'see, let us, behold, just' ( 63 , $64,67,68,122,148,172$ ) and still others are so by praise-loaded exclamations or interjections such as 'wonderful!, ha!, good! good!' ( 125,160 , and 196). Interestingly, the Themes in ' $213,218,219,220$ 'combine the invocative imperative mood with the exclamatory one. In fact, these praise-loaded forms can be rewritten into 'may...live long,' and express the speaker's admiration for the North-South cooperation in the exploitation of Kenya's resources.
There also are a few elements from classes 'b, c, d' which are qualified as ' multiple Themes' (Eggins, 2004: 307): the Themes in ' $10,17,22,30,42,54,60,75,92,105$, and 113 ' ( Text $_{1}$ ) and those in ' $18,24,77,85,98,139,148,149,167$, 173 , and 202 ( text $_{2}$ ). Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 below display the thematic structure of such clauses in both texts, with the first number standing for the clause and the second one after the colon standing for the text in which the clause appears. Two major structures come up: $\mathbf{x}=$ 'textual (+textual) +interpersonal+ topical' and $\mathbf{y}=$ 'interpersonal (1, 2, 3, and 4)+ textual+ topical'. Table ${ }_{5.1}$ and table ${ }_{5.2}$ respectively reflect the $x$-type and y-type Thematic structures

Tabl 5.1: X-type Thematic Structure of multiple Theme-clauses in the texts

| Clause $\mathrm{n}^{\circ}$ : THEME |  |  |  |  | RHEME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| text ${ }^{\circ}$ | textual | textual | interpersonal | topical |  |
| (10:1) | and | likewise |  | he |  |
| (17:1) | And | So |  | he....he | came.... |
| (54:1) |  | Then | Shall | he | sit on the throne of his glory... |
| (60:1) |  | Then | Shall | the King | say unto them on his right hand.... |
| (75:1) |  | Then | Shall | the righteous | answer him......... |
| (92:1) |  | Then | Shall | he | say also onto them........ |
| (105:1) |  | Then | Shall | they | also answer him.... |
| (113:1) |  | Then | Shall | he | answer them.......... |
| (18:2) | so that | when | eventually | I | go back to .......... |
| (24:2) | And |  | especially | (he | taught them) the art..... |
| (77:2) | and | So |  | the lord | went away........ |
| (85:2) | And | So |  | he | made a profit...... |
| (98:2) | And | Then |  | he | dug a whole....... |
| (149:2) | and | So |  | I | Went .... |
| (204: 2) | because | even after |  | I | had left.............. |


| Table 5.2 Y-typeThematic Structure of multiple Theme-clauses in the texts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lause } n^{\circ} \text { : } \\ & \text { text } n^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | THEME |  |  |  |  |  |  | RHEME |
|  | Interpersonal |  |  |  |  | Textual | topical |  |
|  | comment adjunct | vocative adjunct |  |  | Modal operator |  |  | $\ldots \ldots$ |
| (22:1) | Well $\quad$ Thou good and faithful servantdone, |  |  |  |  |  | thou | ....... |
| (30:1) | Well done, | Thou good and faithful servant |  |  |  |  | thou | ......... |
| (139:2) |  | (1) | (2) | (3) |  |  | I | ............ |
|  |  | You, | lord master, | mem white |  |  |  |  |
| (168:2) |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |  | you | .......... |
|  |  | You, | bad, unf and lazy servant | mem rebel | could not |  |  |  |

The contribution of the textual and structural Themes to the thematic structure is discussed in section 5 .

## 5. Analysis of Taxis and Rankshift in the Texts

Table 6 below recapitulates and classifies the use of such textual and structural elements in the Thematic position.

Table 6. Recapitulation of Taxis and Rankshift features of the texts

| Texts | Types of taxis | Sub-types of tactic relations | Clauses of occurrence | Quantity \& rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Text ${ }_{1}$ | Parataxis: 67 (65.05\%) | Additive (and, then) | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2,2,4,6,7,9,10,13,14,16,17,18,33,34 \text {, } \\ & 36,37,38,41,42.2,44,46,47,48,50,53,54, \\ & 55,56,58,60,64,66,68,70,72,74,75,77, \\ & 79,81,83,86,87,88,92,95,97,99,103,105, \\ & 112,113,117 . \end{aligned}$ | 53(51.46\%) |
|  |  | Adversative (but) | 12, 49, 59, 118 | 04 14(13 |
|  |  | Variative (or) | $78,82,84,85,107,108,109,110,111$. | 09 -59\%) |
|  |  | causal (so, therefore) | 17. | 01 |
|  | hypotaxis: $14$ <br> (13.59\%) | -causality (for) | 1, 47, 63, 94, 96, 98, 100, 102. | 0814 |
|  |  | -temporality (after, when, | 1.1.1.1, 52. | $\begin{array}{ll} 02 & (13 . \\ 59 \%) \end{array}$ |
|  |  | location(where): | 42.1.1, 42.2.1. | 02 |
|  |  | -condition (in as much as) | 97, 123 | 02 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rankshift } \\ & (22: 21.36 \%) \end{aligned}$ | relative clauses (who, which, that, whom, etc) | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1,1.2,7.1,10.1,12.1,17.1,25.1,33.1,39.1, \\ & 46.1,47.1,59.1 . ; 35.1,35.2,35.2 .1,35.3 \\ & 35.3 .1,42.1,42.1 .1,42.2,42.2 .1,49.2 \end{aligned}$ | 22 |
| Text ${ }_{2}$ | Parataxis:$80(44.20 \%)$ | additive (and, then) | $\begin{aligned} & 7,9,12,13,14,20,21,24,29,30,31,33,37, \\ & 41,48,49,51,53,55,56,58,62,69,72,75, \\ & 76,77,78,79,80,81,82,84,85,87,88,94, \\ & 96,97,98,99,100,103,104,107,108,113, \\ & 114,118,119,122,123,133,136,137,141, \\ & 150,157,166,171,175,186,188,194,211, \\ & 212,217, \end{aligned}$ | 67 (37.02\%) |
|  |  | Adversative (but) | 17, 47, 86, 190; 209, | 0513 |
|  |  | Variative (or) | 92, 168, | 02 (07.1 |
|  |  | causal (so, therefore) | 77, 85, 95, 127, 150, 207 | 06 8\%) |
|  | Hypotaxis: | -causality/purpose (because, | $11,12,40,45,50,52,60,134,143,149,169$, | 19 |

$41(22.65 \%)$ for, so that) $\quad 173,189,196,199,201,208,210,213$.

| -temporality (when, until, $8,13,25,27,34,46,185,201,206$, <br> after, before) | 09 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| -condition (if..not, unless) | $43,66,91,92,93,151,152,163$. | 08 |
| -comparison (as, than): | $61,154,205$. | 03 |
| -location: where | 144,174 | 02 |


| Rank-shift (60: 33.15\%) | relative clauses (who, which, that, whom, etc) | 1.1, 1.1.1.1, 2.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.1.1, 17.1, 21.1, 23.1, 40.1, 47.1, 47.2, 78.1, 82.1, 86.1, 87.1 94.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 119.1, 130.1, 135.1 , 137.1, 146.1, 147.1, 164.1, 165.1, 169.1 176.1, 178.1, 182.1, 184, 188.1, 191.1, 195.1 213.1, 214.1., 1.1.1, 4.1, 12.1, 21.1, 26.1, 27.1 34.1, 34.2, 35.1, 56.1, 86.2, 89.1, 90.1, 94.1 , 100.1, 110.1, 127.1, 158.1, 171.1, 171.1.1, 177.1, 187.1, 187.2. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

It must be noted that $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ logical relations have been identified in Text ${ }_{1}$ while Text ${ }_{2}$ contains 181 such relations. As can be seen in table ${ }_{6}$, the most frequent relation between the clauses and sentences in both texts is that of coordination or parataxis -[text $1: \mathbf{6 5 . 0 5 \%}$ ); text $2: \mathbf{4 4 . 2 0 \%}$ ] -, this entails that sequences of clauses of similar status or equal importance linked either through an additive relationship (and, then), or a contrastive one 'but, however, yet' or variative one 'or, instead' or a causal one (so, therefore, thus, then'.

Additive conjunctions appear as the most dominant in this paratactic system, accounting for $\mathbf{5 1 . 4 6} \%$ of use in text ${ }_{1}$ and $\mathbf{3 7 . 0 2 \%}$ in text 2 . This involves that little contradiction is involved in the line of argument, even though all these conjunctions, be they (additive, contrastive, variative or causal) contribute to the logico-semantic expression of expansion (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2004). In addition, the pervasive use of the conjunction 'and' to link main clauses in both texts gives the impression of a recitation of events in the structure of a list, as much as a child might (do) in telling a story (Cummings \& Simmons, 1983: 93), even though this use is more intense in text ${ }_{1}$ than in text ${ }_{2}$, given the rate gap between them. Interestingly, there is a case of Theme-reiteration ( $10 \mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}$ ) in text ${ }_{1}$, which is considered as a feature of rapid conversational speech (Eggins, 1994: 289; 2004: 312).
The use of hypotaxis is higher in text ${ }_{2}$ than in text ${ }_{1}-\left[\right.$ text $_{1}: \mathbf{1 3 . 5 9 \%}$; text $\left.\mathbf{t a}_{2} \mathbf{2 2 . 6 5 \%}\right]$ - This means that the second text attaches twice more dependent clauses to main ones in a relation of unequal status than text. However, even though the dependent clauses appear to be structurally of lower status to the main ones, they help to expand their meanings by adding dimensions of time, place, causality, conditions, etc. to them. In fact, in most cases, the removal of the subordinating conjunction and the placement of a comma or period would make a main clause and its subordinate one appear as two independent clauses, even though the logico-semantic relationship between them would become fuzzy in the absence of the conjunction. Adding parataxis to hypotaxis, it can be said that text $t_{1}$, with a tactic density of $\mathbf{7 8 . 6 4 \%}$, is tactically denser than text ${ }_{2}$ which has $\mathbf{6 6 . 8 5 \%}$ of this density.
In addition to taxis, there is a relatively significant occurrence of rankshift in both texts, which indicates a greater sense of dependency, hierarchy and value within some of the clauses. Just as for hypotaxis, text ${ }_{2}$ has a higher rate of rankshift than text $t_{1}$ [text ${ }_{1}: \mathbf{2 1 . 3 6 \%}$; text $t_{2}: \mathbf{3 3 . 1 5 \%}$ ]. It must be noted that the rates if rankshift in both texts should normally be equal to the sum ' $e+f^{\prime}$ ' table $_{3}$ ) if the total number of clauses ( $t_{1}: 140 ; t_{2}: 277$ ) were considered instead of that of logical relations ( $\mathrm{t}_{1}: 103: \mathrm{t}_{2}: 181$ ) considered in table ${ }_{6}$.
In general, the combination of parataxis, hypotaxis and rankshift leads to complex grammatical structures resulting into the creation of depth, as Cummings \& Simmons (1983: 140) claim:

The number of nodes in a sentence is the measure of its depth, i.e., the complexity of its articulation ... the more divisions in a unit complex, and the more rankshift; the more nodes occur and the greater is the depth. If the situation is a serious one, the fact that depth is intellectually demanding, and hence slows the progress of communication helps to reinforce the considered and weighty nature of what is being said ... it helps to convey a serious and thoughtful tone.

This means that sentence depth is equivalent to the level of its internal grammatical complexity/articulation and is associated with the seriousness and intellectual respectability of the topic or situation. As a result, text 2 has more depth than text ${ }_{1}$. In addition, Eggins (2004) contends that taxis is considered to be more dynamic - it involves little forward planning as the speaker can simply chain on another unit of the same type-and rankshift is more static as it requires some forethought in the construction of the clauses. That is why taxis characterizes spontaneous, spoken language or
 224) writes:

The clause complex is of particular interest in spoken text, because it represents the dynamic potential of the system -the ability to 'choreograph' very long and intricate patterns of semantic movement while maintaining a continuous flow of discourse that is coherent without being constructional. This kind of flow is very uncharacteristic of written language".

As it appears, though both texts are spoken, they exhibit features of both spoken and written mode. However, the higher density of hypotaxis and rankshift in text entails that, though the writer has drawn on a more spoken mode, he has twisted it toward a more written-like one by strengthening this feature of written-ness (Cummings \& Simmons, 1983; Halliday, 1994).

## 6. Recapitulation and Conclusion

This paper helps to reveal a few important things about the grammar of textual metafunction. First, it appears the most difficult to apply as such features as ellipsis can make Theme identification a hard labor. This is probably why less research is carried out in this area at the Maitrise-level in our university (Benin, West Africa). However, it is a worthwhile enterprise as it helps to gauge/challenge the researcher's knowledge of structural intricacies. Secondly, the concern of 'Information Structure Analysis' with intonation patterns makes it difficult to fully apply this grammar to such written-down-to-be-read texts as the present ones.
As statistics earlier show, both texts exhibit the same Theme-types and Thematic Structures, namely the significant occurrence of marked topical themes (circumstances and processes) and of interpersonal Themes to express priority, psychological concern, mode and tenor of discourse (Matthiessen, 1995:20; Eggins, 2004:339). However, drawing on the proposed Theme-classification (table ${ }_{2}$ ) and the statistics in table ${ }_{3}$, there is a difference in the density of these structures, leading to this quantitative Thematic characterization of the texts: a ( $18.57 \%$ vs. $28.16 \%$ ); $\mathbf{b}$ ( $45 \%$ vs. $38.63 \%$ ); $\mathbf{c}(16.43 \%$ vs. $09.75 \%)$; d $(04.29 \%$ vs. $01.80 \%)$; e ( $10 \%$ vs. $13.71 \%$ ); $\mathbf{f}(05.71 \%$ vs. $07.94 \%)$. These figures translate into this qualitative Thematic characterization: $\mathbf{a}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{-}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{+}\right) ; \mathbf{b}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{+}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{-}\right) ; \mathbf{c}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{+}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{-}\right) ; \mathbf{d}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{+}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{-}\right) ; \mathbf{e}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{-}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{+}\right) ; \mathbf{f}\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}{ }^{-}, \mathrm{t}_{2}{ }^{+}\right)$. The first item means that text contains a lower rate of type-a Theme structure than text ${ }_{2}$, etc, which entails a differential Thematic focus (Eggins, 2004: 340-41).
Likewise, while both texts exhibit significant uses of taxis and rankshift (table ${ }_{6}$ ), there is a significant difference in the use of parataxis ( $\mathbf{6 5 . 0 5 \%}$ vs. $\mathbf{4 4 . 2 0 \%}$ ), hypotaxis ( $\mathbf{1 3 . 5 9 \%}$ vs. $\mathbf{2 2 .} \mathbf{6 5 \%}$ and rankshift ( $\mathbf{2 1 . 3 6 \%}$ vs. $\mathbf{3 3 . 1 5 \%}$ ) (table ). While the first gap is earlier interpreted as an orientation of text ${ }_{1}$ toward more spoken-ness than text ${ }_{2}$ (Cummings \& Simmons, 1983; 140; Halliday, 1994: 224), the second one can be in terms of the 'main/dominant' versus 'dependent/subordinate' hierarchy. As a fact, the lesser use of hypotaxis in text may be due to the fact that Christ holds a near 'equal-to-equal' tenor with his disciples while the capitalist stresses more the 'master-slave' one to his servants. As for the gap in the use of rankshift, it may be interpreted, on the one hand, as the capitalist master's stronger emphasis on the God-ordained perfect system of unequal master-slave tenor, and on the other, as the writer's inclination toward written-ness.
On the whole, by showing that both texts blend features of both spoken and written modes, this study confirms Bahktin's (1981: 262-3) view of the novel as kind of dialogism -a reproduction of the intrinsic cultural and ideological heteroglossia of language, as he writes:

The novel can be defined as a diversity of speech types (sometimes even a diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized.....These distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech forms, its dispersion into rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogization -this is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistics of the novel.

Finally, this exploration into the textual metafunction has yielded quite interesting insights into the mode variable encoded in the texts, as one of the interpersonal metafunction is likely to yield into the tenor variable, an option for future research. At any rate, the writer's adoption of Bible topics and speech has not prevented him from manipulating Thematic structure and Taxis to convey the different ideologies expressed by the two characters or imitators of Bible discourse in the articulation of their political beliefs (Martin, 1992: 12).
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## Appendices

Text 1
${ }^{(\mathbf{1 )}}$ [Forthe kingdom of heaven ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ is as a man travelling into a far country], ${ }^{(1.1)}$ [ who ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ called his own servants], ${ }^{(1.2}$ [and $(\mathbf{w h o})^{(\mathbf{e})}$ delivered unto them his goods]]. ${ }^{(2)}$ And unto one ${ }^{(b+)}$ he gave five talents], ${ }^{(3)}$ [to another ${ }^{(a+)}$ (he gave) two], ${ }^{(4)}[$ and to another ${ }^{(b+)}$ (he gave) one]; ${ }^{(5)}$ [to every man $^{\left({ }^{(a+)}\right.}$ (he gave) according to his several ability; (6) and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ straightway took his journey]. ${ }^{(7)}$ [Then he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}\left[{ }^{(7.1)}\right.$ that ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ had received the five talents] went] ${ }^{(8)}$ [ and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ traded with the same], ${ }^{(9)}$ and $(\mathrm{he})^{(\mathbf{b})}$ made them other five talents]. ${ }^{(10 . a)}$ [And likewise he ${ }^{(d)(10.1)}$ [ that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ had received two], ${ }^{(10 . b)}$ he also gained other two]. ${ }^{(11)}$ [Buthe ${ }^{(11.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(e)}$ had received one]went] ${ }^{(12)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ digged in the earth], ${ }^{(13)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ hid his lord's money]. ${ }^{(14)}$ [After a long time ${ }^{\left({ }^{(a+)}\right.}$ the lord of those servants cometh], ${ }^{(15)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ reckoneth with them]. ${ }^{(16)}$ [And sohe ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})(16.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathbf{( e )}}$ had received five talents came] ${ }^{(17)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ brought other five talents, saying], ${ }^{(18)}$ [Lord, thou ${ }^{(\mathbf{c )}}$ deliveredst unto me five talents]: ${ }^{(19)}\left[\underline{\text { behold, } \mathrm{I}^{(\mathbf{c})}}\right.$ have gained beside them five talents more]. ${ }^{(20)}$ [His lord ${ }^{(\mathbf{a r )}}$ said unto him], ${ }^{(21)}$ [Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou ${ }^{(\mathbf{c )}}$ hast been faithful over a few things], ${ }^{(22)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{( a )}}\right.$ will make thee ruler over many things]: ${ }^{(23)}$ [enter ${ }^{(a)}$ thou into the joy of thy lord]. ${ }^{(24)}\left[\right.$ Healso $^{(a)(24.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ had received two talents]came] ${ }^{(25)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ said], ${ }^{(26)}\left[\right.$ Lord, thou ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ deliveredst unto me two talents]. ${ }^{(27)}$ [behold, I ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ have gained two other talents beside them]. ${ }^{(28)}$ [His lord ${ }^{(a)}$ said unto him], ${ }^{(29)}$ [Well done, good and faithful servant; thou (c) hast been faithful over a few things], ${ }^{(30)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ will make thee ruler over many things]: ${ }^{(31)}$ [enter ${ }^{(a)}$ thou into the joy of thy lord]. ${ }^{(32)}$ Then he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})(32.1)}\left[\right.$ which $^{(\mathbf{e})}$ had received the one talent] came] ${ }^{(33)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ said], ${ }^{(34)}$ [Lord, I ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ knew thee] ${ }^{(34.1)}$ [that thou ${ }^{(\mathbf{f )}}$ art an hard man; ${ }^{(34.2)}$ [(that thou ${ }^{(f)}$ art) reaping (in a place)] ${ }^{(34.2 .1)}$ [where thou ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ hast not sown], ${ }^{(34.3)}$ [and (that thou ${ }^{(f)}$ art)gathering (in a place)] ${ }^{(34.3 .1)}$ [where thou ${ }^{(b)}$ hast not strawed]: ${ }^{(35)}$ [And I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ was afraid], ${ }^{(36)}$ [and
(I) $^{(\mathrm{b})}$ went $]^{(37)}\left[\right.$ and $(\mathrm{I})^{(\mathrm{b})}$ hid thy talent in the earth]: ${ }^{(38)}$ $\underline{0}$, there thou ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ hast ${ }^{(38.1)}\left[\right.$ that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ is thine] ${ }^{(3)}$ [His lord ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ answered] ${ }^{(40)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ said unto him], ${ }^{(41)}$ [Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ knewest $]^{(41.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ reap (in a place) ${ }^{(41.11)}\left[\right.$ where $^{(\text {e })}$ Isowed not], ${ }^{(41.2)}$ [ and (that I) gather (in a place)] ${ }^{(41.2 .1)}\left[\right.$ where $^{(e)} I$ have not strawed]: ${ }^{(42)}$ [Thou ${ }^{(a)}$ oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers], ${ }^{(43)}$ [ and then at my coming ${ }^{(b+)}$ I should have received
 talents], ${ }^{(46)}$ [For unto every one ${ }^{(b+)(46.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ hath] shall be given], ${ }^{(47)}$ [and he ${ }^{(b)}$ shall have abundance]: ${ }^{(48)}$ [ but from him $^{(b+)}{ }^{(48.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ hath not] shall be taken awayeven that] ${ }^{(48.2)}$ [which he ${ }^{(f)}$ hath]. ${ }^{(49)}$ [And cast ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness]: ${ }^{(50)}$ [there ${ }^{(a)}$ shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth].
${ }^{(51)}$ [When the Son of man ${ }^{(\mathbf{b + )}}$ shall come in his glory], ${ }^{(52)}$ [and all the holy angels ${ }^{(b)}$ (shall come) with him], ${ }^{(53)}$ [then shallhe ${ }^{(d+)}$ sit upon the throne of his glory]: ${ }^{(54)}$ [And before him ${ }^{(\mathbf{b + )}}$ shall be gathered all nations]: ${ }^{(55)}$ [and he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall separate them one from another], ${ }^{(56)}$ [as a shepherd ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ divideth his sheep from the goats]: ${ }^{(57)}$ [ And he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b b})}$ shall set the sheep on his right hand], ${ }^{(58)}$ [but (he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall set ) the goats on the left]. ${ }^{(59)}$ [Then shall the King ${ }^{(d+)}$ say unto them on his right hand], ${ }^{(60)}$ [Come ${ }^{(\text {(a) }}$, ye blessed of my Father], ${ }^{(61)}$ [inherit ${ }^{\left({ }^{(2)}\right.}$ the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world]: ${ }^{(62)}\left[\underline{\text { For I }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}\right.$ was hungered], ${ }^{(63)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ gave me meat]: ${ }^{(64)} \underline{I}^{(\mathbf{a b})}$ was thirsty], ${ }^{(65)}\left[\underline{\text { and ye }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ gave me drink]: ${ }^{(66)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ was a stranger], ${ }^{(67)}\left[\right.$ and ye ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ took me in]:(68)$\left[\left(\underline{I}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.\right.$ was) Naked], ${ }^{(69)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ clothed me]: ${ }^{(70)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ was sick], ${ }^{(71)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ visited me]: ${ }^{(72)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ was in prison, ${ }^{(73)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ came unto me]. ${ }^{(74)}$ [Then shall the righteous ${ }^{(d+)}$ answer him, saying], ${ }^{(75)}$ [Lord, when ${ }^{(c)\left({ }^{(*)}\right)}$ saw we thee hungered], ${ }^{(76)}$ [and(we) ${ }^{(b)}$ fed thee? ${ }^{(77)}$ [or (when ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ saw we thee) thirsty, ${ }^{(78)}$ [and (we) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ gave thee drink?] $]^{(79)}\left[(\text { Lord }) \text { When }{ }^{(\mathrm{c})}{ }^{(*)} \text { saw we thee a stranger], }{ }^{(80)} \text { [and (we) }\right)^{(\mathbf{b})}$ took thee in]? ${ }^{(81)}$ [ $\underline{\boldsymbol{o r}\left(\text { when }^{(\mathrm{c})}\right.}$ saw we thee) naked], ${ }^{(82)}\left[\right.$ and $\left(\right.$ we) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ clothed thee?] ${ }^{(83)}\left[\right.$ Or when ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ saw we thee sick], ${ }^{(84)}\left[\underline{0 r}\right.$ (when ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ saw we thee) in prison], ${ }^{(85)}$ [and (we) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ came unto thee? ] ${ }^{(86)}$ [And the King ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall answer] ${ }^{(87)}$ [ and (he ${ }^{(b)}$ shall) say unto them], ${ }^{(88)}$ [Verily I ${ }^{(\mathbf{c}+)}$ say unto you], ${ }^{(89)}$ Inasmuch asye ${ }^{(\mathbf{b + )}}$ have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren], ${ }^{(90)}$ [ye ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ have done it unto me].
${ }^{(91)}$ [Then shall he ${ }^{\left({ }^{(d)}\right)}$ say also unto them on the left hand], ${ }^{(92)}$ [Depart ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels]: ${ }^{(93)(*)}$ [For I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ was hungered], ${ }^{(94)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ gave me no meat]: ${ }^{(95)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{b )}}\right.$ was thirsty], ${ }^{(96)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ gave me no drink]: ${ }^{(97)}\left[\underline{I}^{(b)}\right.$ was a stranger], ${ }^{(98)}\left[\right.$ and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ took me not in]: ${ }^{(99)}\left[\left(\underline{I}^{(b)}\right.\right.$ was) naked], ${ }^{(100)}$ [ and ye ${ }^{(b)}$ clothed me not]: ${ }^{(101)}\left[\left(I^{(b)}\right.\right.$ was) sick], ${ }^{(102)}$ [and (I ${ }^{(b)}$ was) in prison], ${ }^{(103)}$ [and ye ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ visited me not]. ${ }^{(104)}$ Then shall they ${ }^{(d+)}$ also answer him, saying], ${ }^{(105)}$ [Lord, when ${ }^{(*)(c)}$ saw we thee hungered, ${ }^{(106)}$ or (when ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ saw we thee) thirsty, ${ }^{(107)}$ [or (when ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ saw we thee) a stranger, ${ }^{(108)}$ [or (when( ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ saw we thee) naked, ${ }^{(109)}$ [or (When ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ saw we thee) sick, ${ }^{(110)}$ [or (when ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ saw we thee) in prison], ${ }^{(111)}$ [and (we) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ did not minister unto thee?] ${ }^{(112)}$ Then shall he ${ }^{(\mathrm{d})}$ answer them, saying], ${ }^{(113)}$ [Verily I ${ }^{\left({ }^{(+)}\right)}$say unto you], ${ }^{(144)}$ [Inasmuch as ye ${ }^{\left(\mathbf{b}^{\circ}\right)}$ did it not to one of the least of these], ${ }^{(115)}\left[\mathrm{ye}^{(\mathbf{a})}\right.$ did it not to me]. ${ }^{(116)}$ [ And these ${ }^{(b)}$ shall go away into everlasting punishment]: ${ }^{(117)}$ [but the righteous ${ }^{(b)}$ (shall go) into life eternal]. (Matthew 25: 14-46)
text $_{2}$
${ }^{(1)}\left[\right.$ For the Kingdom of Earthly Wiles ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ can be likened unto a ruler $]{ }^{(1.1)}\left[\text { who }{ }^{(\mathbf{e})} \text { foresaw] }\right]^{(1.1 .1)}$ [that the day ${ }^{(f)}$ would come $]^{(1.1 .1 .1)}\left[\right.$ when ${ }^{(\text {e) }}$ he would be thrown out of a certain country by the masses and their guerrilla freedom fighters]. ${ }^{(2)}$ [ $\underline{H e}^{(\mathrm{a})}$ was much troubled in his heart, trying to determine ways of protecting all the property] ${ }^{(2.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ he had accumulated in that country and also ways of maintaining his rule over the natives by other means]. ${ }^{(3)}\left[\mathrm{He}^{(a)}\right.$ asked himself]: ${ }^{(4)}$ [what ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ shall I do, seeing] ${ }^{(4.1)}$ [that these people ${ }^{(f)(4.1 .1)}$ [over whom ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ I have always lorded] are now about to expel me from these plantations and factories $]^{(4.11 .1)}\left[\text { that }{ }^{(\mathbf{e})} \text { I have taken from them? }\right]^{(5)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ can no longer cultivate the fields $]$; ${ }^{(6)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{a})}\right.$ can no longer work with my hands]. (7) $\left[\right.$ And if I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ wait $]{ }^{(8)}\left[\right.$ until $\mathrm{I}^{(\mathbf{b})}$ am clubbed $]{ }^{(9)}\left[\right.$ and ( $\mathrm{I}^{(\mathbf{b})}$ am) gunned out of the country], ${ }^{(10)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)} \text { will live forever in shame }\right]^{(11)}\left[\underline{\text { because all the hair-raising stories }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ I have told them about the invincible might of my armoured cars and bombs], ${ }^{(12)}$ [and because I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ have always tried to show them] ${ }^{(12.1)}$ [that the white race ${ }^{(f)}$ can never be dominated by the black race]. ${ }^{(13)}$ [And when the guerrillas ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ win], ${ }^{(14)}$ [and they ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ seize the key of the country], ${ }^{(15)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ shall never be able to repossess these plantations and industries]. ${ }^{(16)}$ [This tea, this rice, this cotton, this coffee, these precious stones, these hotels, these shops, these factories, these fruits of their precious sweat -these and more ${ }^{(10 \mathrm{a})}$ shall be lost unto me]. ${ }^{(17)}\left[\right.$ But now ${ }^{(\mathbf{b + )}} \mathrm{I}$ know] ${ }^{(17.1)}$ [what ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ I shall do], ${ }^{(18)}$ [so that when eventually I ${ }^{(d)}$ go back to my own country through the front door $],{ }^{(19)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ shall be able to return here through the back door], ${ }^{(20)}$ [and (I) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall be well received], ${ }^{(21)}$ [and ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall be able to plant seeds] ${ }^{(21.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ will take root more firmly] ${ }^{(21.2)}$ [than the ones ${ }^{(f)}$ I planted before].
${ }^{(22)}\left[\mathrm{He}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ called his loyalist slaves and servants to him]. ${ }^{(23)}\left[\mathrm{He}^{(\mathbf{a})}\right.$ taught them all the earthly wiles] ${ }^{(23.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ he knew], ${ }^{(24)}$ and especially (he ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ taught them) the trick of sprinkling theft and robbery with the sweetest-smelling perfumes, and the trick of wrapping poison in sugar-coated leaves, and many tricks for dividing the country's workers and peasants through bribery and appeals to tribe and religion]. ${ }^{(25)}$ [When he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ had finished], ${ }^{(26)}\left[\right.$ he ${ }^{(\mathbf{a})}$ informed them] ${ }^{(26.1)}$ [that he ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ was about to leave for his country overseas]. ${ }^{(27)}$ [When they ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ heard] ${ }^{(27.1)}$ [that their lord and master ${ }^{(\mathbf{f )}}$ was about to leave], ${ }^{(28)}$ [the loyalist slaves and servants ${ }^{(\mathbf{a})}$ rent their clothes] ${ }^{(29)}$ [and (they) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ smeared their $\overline{\text { bodies }}$ with ashes], ${ }^{(30)}\left[\right.$ and they ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ knelt down] ${ }^{(31)}\left[\right.$ and (they) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ cried]: ${ }^{(32)}\left[\right.$ how $^{(\mathbf{a x})}$ can you go away] ${ }^{(33)}$ [and (how ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ can you) leave us here, mere orphans], ${ }^{(34)}$ [when you ${ }^{(b)}$ know full well] ${ }^{(34.1)}$ [how we ${ }^{(f)}$ have persecuted the masses] ${ }^{(34.2)}$ [and (how we ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ have) perpetrated many other crimes in your name]? ${ }^{(35)}$ [Did you not ${ }^{(\mathrm{cc})}$ vow] ${ }^{(35.1)}$ [that you ${ }^{(f)}$ would never leave this loan d]? ${ }^{(36)}\left[\right.$ How $^{(2)}$ can you leave us to the mercy of the nationalist guerrillas]?
${ }^{(37)}$ [And the lord, their master ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ told them]: ${ }^{(38)}$ ['Are you ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ possessed of so little faith]? ${ }^{(39)}$ [Let not your heart ( ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ be troubled], ${ }^{(40)}\left[\underline{\text { for you }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ must trust in the God] ${ }^{(40.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\text {(e) }}$ I have taught you to know], ${ }^{(41)}$ [and you ${ }^{(b)}$ should also trust in me, the interpreter of his Will]. ${ }^{(42)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ have many ways of fulfilling my wishes in this land]. ${ }^{(43)}$ [If that ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ were not so], ${ }^{(44)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ would have told you], ${ }^{(45)}$ [so that you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ would have time to flee or to find ropes to hang yourselves with] ${ }^{(46)}\left[\right.$ before you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ are caught by the patriots]. ${ }^{(47)}\left[\right.$ But ${ }^{(47.1)}$ [what ${ }^{(\text {(e) }}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{a})}\right.$ wish to do now] is to prepare positions of leadership for you and to add a little more to the crumbs] ${ }^{(47.2)}\left[\underline{\text { that }}{ }^{(\mathbf{e q})}\right.$ you have been gathering from my table]. ${ }^{(48)}$ [And later ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ I shall return with lots of money and many banks], ${ }^{(49)}\left[\right.$ and I ${ }^{(b)}$ shall also bring you more armoured cars and guns and bombs and aeroplanes], ${ }^{(50)}\left[\underline{s o t h a t ~}{ }^{(\mathbf{b})} \text { shall be with you }\right]^{(51)}\left[\underline{a n d}\right.$ you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ (shall be) with me], ${ }^{(52)}\left[\underline{\text { so that we }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b})}\right.$ may
love one another always] ${ }^{(53)}$ and (we ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ may)eat together], ${ }^{(54)}\left[\underline{1}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ sating myself on choice dishes], ${ }^{(55)}\left[\right.$ and you ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ collecting up the precious remains].
${ }^{(56)}$ [And it ${ }^{(b)}$ came to pass] ${ }^{(56.1)}$ [that as the ruler ${ }^{(f)}$ was about to return to his home abroad], ${ }^{(57)}\left[\right.$ he $^{(a)}$ again called together all the servants] ${ }^{(58)}$ [and $(\text { he })^{(b)}$ gave them the key to the land, telling them]: ${ }^{(59)}$ [ The patriotic guerrillas and the masses of this country ${ }^{(\text {a) }}$ will now be deceived], ${ }^{(60)}$ [because you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ are all black], ${ }^{(61)}\left[\right.$ as they ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ are], ${ }^{(62)}$ [and they ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ will chant]: ${ }^{(63)}$ [ "See, now ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ our black people have the key to our country]; ${ }^{(64)}$ [see, now ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ our own black people hold the steering wheel]. ${ }^{(65)}$ [What ${ }^{(\text {a) }}$ were we fighting for] ${ }^{(66)}\left[\right.$ if it ${ }^{(b)}$ is not this?] ${ }^{(67)}\left[\right.$ Let us ${ }^{(\text {c) }}$ now put down our arms], ${ }^{(68)}$ [and (let us) ${ }^{(c)}$ sing hymns of praise to our black lords]. ${ }^{(69)}\left[\right.$ Then he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ gave them his property and goods to look after and even to increase and multiply]. ${ }^{(70)}$ [To one ${ }^{(a+)}$ he gave capital amounting to 500,000 shillings $],{ }^{(71)}\left[\right.$ to another ${ }^{(a+)}$ (he gave) 200,000 shillings], ${ }^{(72)}$ [and to another ${ }^{(b+)}$,(he gave) 100,000 shillings], ${ }^{(73)}$ [to every servant ${ }^{(a+)}$ (he gave) ] ${ }^{(74)}\left[{ }^{(*)}\right.$ according to how loyally ${ }^{(\text {a) }}$ he had served his master], ${ }^{(75)}$ [and (how loyally ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ he) followed his faith], ${ }^{(76)}$ [and (how loyally ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ he) shared his outlook]. ${ }^{(77)}$ [And so the lord ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ went away, leaving by the front door]. ${ }^{(78)}$ [And the servant ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})(78.1)}$ [who ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ had received 500,000 shillings immediately] set out] ${ }^{(79)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ bought things cheaply from the rural peasants], ${ }^{(80)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ sold them to the urban workers at a higher price], ${ }^{(81)}$ [and in this way ${ }^{(b+)}($ he $)$ made a profit of 500,000 shillings]. ${ }^{(82)}$ [And the one ${ }^{(b)(82.1)}\left[\right.$ who $^{(\mathbf{e x})}$ had received 200,000 shillings] did the same]: ${ }^{(83)}\left[\right.$ he $^{(\mathrm{a})}$ bought cheaply from producers], ${ }^{(84)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(b)}$ sold dearly to consumers], ${ }^{(85)}$ [and so he ${ }^{(b)}$ made a profit of 200,000 shillings]. ${ }^{(86)}$ [But he ${ }^{(b)(86.1)}\left[\underline{\text { who }}{ }^{(\text {e })}\right.$ had received only 100,000 shillings] thought] ${ }^{(86.2)}\left[(\right.$ that $)$ he ${ }^{(f)}$ was clever], ${ }^{(87)}[$ and he ${ }^{(b)}$ reviewed his life and that of the masses of the land, and that of the master] ${ }^{(87.1)}\left[\mathbf{w h o}^{(\mathrm{e})}\right.$ had just left for a foreign country]. ${ }^{(88)}$ [And he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ began to talk to himself, saying]: ${ }^{(89)}$ [This lord and master ${ }^{(\text {a) }}$ has always bragged] ${ }^{(89.1)}$ [that he ${ }^{(f)}$ alone developed this country with the aid of the small amount of money] ${ }^{(89.2)}$ [that he ${ }^{(f)}$ came with, shouting, 'Capital! Capital!'] ${ }^{\left({ }^{(9)}\right)}\left[\right.$ Now ${ }^{(a+)}$ let me see $]{ }^{(90.1)}\left[\right.$ whether capital ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ will yield profit $]{ }^{(91)}$ [without $\left(\right.$ it ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ being watered with the sweat of the worker $]^{(\mathbf{9 2})}\left[\underline{\mathbf{o r}}\right.$ without ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ buying cheap the labour of the peasant and worker]. ${ }^{(93)}\left[\underline{I f}\right.$ it ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ produces profit by itself], ${ }^{(94)}$ [then I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall know beyond all doubt] ${ }^{(94.1}\left[\right.$ that it ${ }^{(\mathbf{f})}$ is money ${ }^{(94.1 .1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ develops a country]. ${ }^{(95)}$ [ $\underline{\text { So he }}$ ${ }^{(b)}$ went], ${ }^{(96)}[\text { and (he) })^{(b)}$ put the 100,000 shillings in a tin] ${ }^{(97)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ covered it well], ${ }^{(98)}$ [and then (he) ${ }^{(b)}$ dug a hole by a banana plant], ${ }^{(99)}$ [and he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ buried the tin there].
${ }^{(100)}$ [And it ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ came to pass] ${ }^{(100.1)}$ [that before many days ${ }^{(f)}$ had elapsed], ${ }^{(101)}$ [the lord ${ }^{(a)}$ came back to that country, through the back door, to check on the property] ${ }^{(101.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ he had left behind]. ${ }^{(102)}\left[\mathrm{He}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ called his servants to account for the property and the money] ${ }^{(102.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ he had given to each]. ${ }^{(103)}$ [And the one ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ ${ }^{(103.1)}\left[\right.$ who $^{(\mathrm{e})}$ had been given 500,000 shillings] came] ${ }^{(104)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ said]: ${ }^{(105)}$ [ 'My lord and master , you ${ }^{(\mathbf{c )}}$ left me with capital of 500,000 shillings]. ${ }^{(106)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ have doubled it.] ${ }^{(107)}$ And the lord ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ was truly amazed,] ${ }^{(108)}\left[\right.$ and he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ exclaimed: ' 100 per cent profit? A fantastic rate of profit! $]{ }^{(109)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(\mathbf{b )}}\right.$ have done well, you good and faithful servant]. ${ }^{(110)}$ Y You ${ }^{(a)}$ have proved] ${ }^{(110.1)}$ [that you ${ }^{(f)}$ can be trusted with a little property]. ${ }^{(111)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ shall make you an overseer of many enterprises]. ${ }^{(112)}$ [Come $\left.{ }^{(\text {a })}\right]{ }^{(113)}\left[\right.$ and share ${ }^{(b)}$ in your lord's happiness and prosperity]. ${ }^{(114)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ shall make you managing director of the local branches of my banks here] ${ }^{(115)}\left[\right.$ and $\mathrm{I}^{(\mathrm{b})}$ shall appoint you a director of certain companies]. ${ }^{(116)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(a)}\right.$ will also acquire a few shares in the same companies]. ${ }^{(117)}$ [From today ${ }^{(\mathbf{a})}$ I shall not let my face be too visible]. ${ }^{(118)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(a)}\right.$ shall represent me in this country].'
${ }^{(119)}$ [And the one ${ }^{(b)(119.1)}$ [who ${ }^{(\text {(e) }}$ had been given 200,000 shillings] came] ${ }^{(120)}$ [and (he)told the master]: ${ }^{(121) ‘}$ [My lord and master, you ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ left me with 200,000 shillings]. ${ }^{(122)}$ [Behold, your capital ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ has yielded another 200,000 shillings].' ${ }^{(123)}\left[\right.$ And the lord ${ }^{(b)}$ spoke] ${ }^{(124)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ said: ] ${ }^{(125)}$ [ 'Wonderful, this ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ is really wonderful: such a rising rate of profit! A stable country for investment]. ${ }^{(126)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(\mathrm{ax})}\right.$ have done well, you good and faithful servant]. ${ }^{(127)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ have proved] ${ }^{(127.1)}$ [that you ${ }^{(f)}$ can be trusted with a little property]; ${ }^{(128)}\left[{ }^{\mathbf{s o n}}{ }^{\text {now }}{ }^{(\mathbf{b +})} \mathbf{I}\right.$ shall make you an overseer of many enterprises]. ${ }^{(129)}\left[\underline{\text { Share }}{ }^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ in the happiness and prosperity of your master]. ${ }^{(130)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ shall make you a sales director of the local branches of my industries, and a director of many other companies] ${ }^{(130.1)}\left[\right.$ that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ I shall show you]. ${ }^{(131)}$ [You too $^{(a)}$ will also acquire a token of shares in the same companies $] .{ }^{(132)}\left[\right.$ From today ${ }^{(a+)} \mathbf{I}$ shall hide my face]. ${ }^{(133)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ shall stay behind the scenes], ${ }^{(134)}$ [and you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ will stand at the door and at the windows], ${ }^{(135)}$ [so that it ${ }^{(b)}$ is your face] $\left(^{135.1)}\right.$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ will always be visible]. ${ }^{(136)}\left[\mathrm{You}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ will be the watchdog of my investments in your country].'
${ }^{(137)}$ [And the one ${ }^{(137.1)}$ [who ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ had been given 100,000 shillings] stepped forward] ${ }^{(138)}$ [and (he) ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ told his master]: ${ }^{(139)}$ ' $\left[\text { You, lord and master, member of the white race; } I{ }^{(\mathrm{c})} \text { have discovered your trick! }\right]^{(140)}\left[\underline{I}^{(\mathrm{a})}\right.$ have also discovered your real name]. ${ }^{(141)}$ [Imperialist ,that's $s^{(\mathbf{c})}$ your real name], ${ }^{(142)}$ [and you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ are a cruel master]. ${ }^{(143)}$ [Why ${ }^{(\text {(a) }}$ ?] ${ }^{(144)}$
 you have never shed any sweat]. ${ }^{(146)}$ [ $\mathrm{You}^{(\mathrm{a})}$ have appointed yourself the distributor of things] ${ }^{(146.1)}$ [which ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ you have
 ${ }^{(150)}\left[\right.$ and (I) ${ }^{(b)}$ buried your money in the ground to see] ${ }^{(151)}\left[\right.$ if your money ${ }^{(b)}$ would yield anything] ${ }^{(152)}$ [without (it) ${ }^{(b)}$ being fertilized by my sweat or that of any other man]. ${ }^{(153)}$ [Behold, here ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ is your 100,000 shillings], ${ }^{(154)}$ [(as) exactly as you ${ }^{(b)}$ left it]. ${ }^{(155)}\left[\underline{I}^{(a)}\right.$ now give you back your capital]. ${ }^{(156)}$ [Count ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ it] ${ }^{(157)}$ [and check ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})(157.1)}$ [that a single cent ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ is missing]. ${ }^{(158)}$ [The most remarkable thing ${ }^{(s)}$ was this]: ${ }^{(159)}$ [my own sweat ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ provided me with food to eat, water to drink, and a shelter in which to sleep]. ${ }^{(160)}$ [Ha! $I^{\left({ }^{(2)}\right)} 1 l$ never kneel down before the lifeless god of capital again]. (161) [ $I^{(a)}$ will be a slave no more]. ${ }^{(162)}$ [My eyes ${ }^{(a)}$ have now been opened]. ${ }^{(163)}$ [If today ${ }^{(b+)}$ I joined hands with all the others] ${ }^{(163.1)}\left[\mathbf{w h o}^{(\mathbf{e x}}\right.$ have opted to be masters over their own sweat], ${ }^{(164)}$ [there ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ would be no limit to the wealth] ${ }^{(164.1)}$ [(that) ${ }^{(\text {(e) }}$ we could produce for our people and our country].
${ }^{(165)}$ [The master ${ }^{(a)}$ looked at him with much bitterness in his eyes, with much pain in his heart]. ${ }^{(166)}$ [Then he ${ }^{(b)}$ spoke to him]: ${ }^{(167)}$ ['You bad, unfaithful and lazy servant, member of the rebellious clan! ${ }^{(*)}$ Could you not ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ have put the money into a bank] ${ }^{(168)}$ [or (Could you not) ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ left it in the hands of those] ${ }^{(168.1)}$ [who ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ trade in money], ${ }^{(169)}$ [so that on coming back ${ }^{(b+)}$ I would reap just a little interest?] ${ }^{(170)}$ [Do you ${ }^{(\mathrm{c})}$ know] ${ }^{(170.1)}\left[\underline{\text { how it }}{ }^{(t)}\right.$ hurts me to find] ${ }^{(170.1 .1)}$ [that you ${ }^{(f)}$ buried my capital in a grave, like a corpse?] (171) [And who ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ has revealed the secret of my name?] (172) $\left[\right.$ Who $^{(\mathbf{a})}$ has advised you to reject me], ${ }^{(173)}\left[\right.$ just becauseI ${ }^{(\mathbf{d})}$ reap (in a place)] ${ }^{(173.1)}\left[\right.$ where I ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ have never sown] ${ }^{(174)}$ $\left[\underline{\text { and }}(\mathrm{I})^{(\mathbf{b})} \text { profit by things }\right]^{(174.1)}$ [over which ${ }^{(\text {(e) }}$ I have never shed any sweat?] ${ }^{(175)}$ [ Who $^{(\mathbf{a})}$ has told you] ${ }^{(175.1)}$ [that
harvesting and husbandry ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ is not hard work?] ${ }^{(176)}$ [No!You black people ${ }^{(\mathrm{c}}$ are incapable of planning and working out ways of cutting the ropes] ${ }^{(176.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ tie you to your masters]. ${ }^{(177)}$ [ $\mathrm{You}^{(\mathrm{a})}$ must therefore have been misled by communists]. ${ }^{(178)}$ [ $\underline{\mathrm{You}}{ }^{(a)}$ must have got those dangerous thoughts from the party of workers and peasants]. ${ }^{(179)}$ [Yes, your mind ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ is poisoned with communist notions]. ${ }^{(180)}$ [Communism....You ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ have become a real threat to the peace and stability] ${ }^{(180.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ used to exist in this country for me and my local representatives, the local guardians of my property]. ${ }^{(181)}$ [ Now $^{(a+)}$ you are going to feel the heat of such a fire] ${ }^{(182)}$ [as will make ${ }^{(\mathrm{d})}$ you forget my real name forever]. ${ }^{(183)}$ [Arrest ${ }^{(\mathbf{a})}$ him, now], ${ }^{(184)}$ [before he ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ spreads these poisonous thoughts to other workers and peasants], ${ }^{(185)}$ [and teaches ${ }^{(\mathrm{b})}$ them] ${ }^{(185.1)}$ [that the power of organized unity ${ }^{(\mathrm{f})}$ is stronger] ${ }^{(185.2)}$ [ than all my bombs and armoured vehicles ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ (are) ! $]^{(186)}$ [Take away ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ even the little] ${ }^{(186.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{eq})}$ he has], ${ }^{(187)}$ [and divide ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ it among yourselves]. ${ }^{(188)}$ [For unto the man of property ${ }^{(\mathbf{b}+)}$ more will be given], ${ }^{(189)}$ [but from the poor man ${ }^{(b+)}$ will be taken even the little] ${ }^{(189.1)}$ [that ${ }^{(\mathrm{e})}$ he has kept in reserve]. ${ }^{(190)}$ [That ${ }^{(\mathrm{a})}$ is the most important of all my commandments]. ${ }^{(191)}\left[\text { What }^{(\mathbf{a +})} \text { are you people waiting for? }\right]^{(192)}\left[\mathbf{G o}^{(\mathbf{a})}\right]^{(193)}\left[\right.$ and get ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ the police and the military to arrest this fellow] ${ }^{(193.1)}\left[\right.$ who $^{(\text {e) }}$ has the audacity to reject slavery]. ${ }^{(194)}$ [Throw ${ }^{(a)}$ him into jail or into everlasting darkness], ${ }^{(195)}$ [so that his family ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ will harvest only tears and the gnashing of teeth!] ${ }^{(196)}$ ['Good! Good!You people ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ have done a fine job]. ${ }^{(197)}\left[\right.$ Mete out ${ }^{(2)}$ the same treatment to all such rebels], ${ }^{(198)}$ [so that the other workers ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ will be too scared to strike for higher wages or to take up arms to smash the chains of slavery.]'
${ }^{(199)}$ [ 'As for you, from now on ${ }^{(\mathbf{a + )}} \mathbf{I}$ shall no longer call you slaves or servants in public]. ${ }^{(200)}$ [ $\mathbf{N o w}^{(a+)}$ you are truly my friends] . ${ }^{(201)}$ [Why $\underline{W r}^{(\mathbf{a})}$ ?] ${ }^{(202)}$ Because even after I ${ }^{(b)}$ had given you back the keys to your country], ${ }^{(203)}$ [you ${ }^{(\mathbf{a})}$ continued to fulfill my commandments and to protect my property, making my capital yield a higher rate of profit] (204) [than was ${ }^{(b+)}$ the case] ${ }^{(205)}$ [when $\underline{I}^{(\mathbf{b})}$ myself used to carry the keys]. ${ }^{(206)}$ [Therefore I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall not call you servants again?] ${ }^{(207)}$ [For a servant ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ does not know the aims and thoughts of his master]. ${ }^{(208)}$ [But I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ call you my friends] ${ }^{(209)}$ [because you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b )}}$ know- ${ }^{(210)}$ [and I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall continue to let you know] -all my plans for this country], ${ }^{(211)}$ [and I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ shall give you some] ${ }^{(211.1)}$ [of what ${ }^{(\mathbf{e})}$ I acquire], ${ }^{(212)}$ [so that you ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ will have the strength and the motivation to break the skulls of those] ${ }^{(212.1)}$ [ $\underline{\text { who }}^{(\mathbf{e})}$ talk about the "masses" with any measure of seriousness]. ${ }^{(213)}$ [Long live ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ peace, love and unity between me and my local representatives!] ${ }^{(214)}$ [What ${ }^{(2)}$ is so bad about that?] ${ }^{(215)}\left[\right.$ You $^{(2)}$ bite twice] ${ }^{(216)}$ [and I ${ }^{(\mathbf{b})}$ bite four times]. ${ }^{(217)}$ [We ${ }^{(a)}{ }^{\boldsymbol{r}} 11$ fool the gullible masses]. ${ }^{(218)}$ [Long live ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ stability for progress!] ${ }^{(219)}$ [Long live ${ }^{(\mathbf{c})}$ progress for profit!] ${ }^{(220)}$ [Long live ${ }^{\left({ }^{(c)}\right)}$ foreigners and foreign expatriates!] (pp. 82-86.)

